

**Remarks**

The Office Action mailed April 2, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-19 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-19 stand rejected.

In addition, and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), a one month extension of time is submitted herewith to extend the due date of the response to the Office Action dated April 2, 2004, for the above-identified patent application from July 2, 2004, through and including August 2, 2004. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(3), authorization to charge a deposit account in the amount of \$110.00 to cover this extension of time request also is submitted herewith. In addition, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and authorization to charge the deposit account the fee for this RCE also accompanies this Amendment.

The rejection of Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Bauer is respectfully traversed.

The Office asserted that Wright discloses a wireless spread spectrum ground link-based aircraft communication system for engine event reporting, and that Wright in particular teaches exporting the extracted data to a destination database by downloading the extracted engine data to a storage medium located at an airport. The Office further asserted that Bauer discloses a method for synchronizing databases wherein successful synchronization between the two databases are recorded in an update log. Wright is also said to indicate that performance of the aircraft and the engine record is accumulated throughout a flight and downloaded to a second computer when the flight is complete. Furthermore, Bauer is said to disclose a method for synchronizing databases wherein successful synchronization between the two databases are recorded in an update log.

In addition, Wright is said to teach the download of accumulated aircraft [data] at the end of each flight, thereby updating the ground database only for a new flight when new data has been accumulated. The Office admits that Wright does not particularly teach update

engine data in the ground database for a single flight based upon the indication that the aircraft database has been updated since the last download, but the Office asserts that Bauer discloses a method for periodically synchronizing databases wherein data from a first database is extracted for export to a second database only if there has been any update to the data in the first database since the last export of data.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that all of the Office's assertions are correct, the combination of Wright and Bauer still do not teach the particular structure and operation recited in Applicants' claims as amended. For example, let us assume, *arguendo*, that Bauer's teachings would allow users of Wright's system to download engine data to the airport database only upon an update to the data since the last download and thereby avoid unnecessary downloads of data if no change has occurred since the last synchronization. Even so, neither Wright nor Bauer nor their combination teach or suggest downloading data recorded in a flight data recorder first to a program database retaining only recent data in a ground-based computer system having an engine monitoring program using the program database, extracting data from the program database, and exporting the retrieved data to a long term storage destination database.

More particularly, Bauer is directed to a database synchronizer (see title), where the term "synchronize" is defined to be the act whereby "data in two databases are restored to consistency. That is, updates performed by either client or server are propagated to the other side when a connection is established and eventually to other clients in the system." Col. 1, lines 50-54. Some of the techniques disclosed in Bauer might arguably be useful in a system in which extracts data from one database and exports that data to another. However, there is no motivation provided by either Bauer or Wright to provide a short term storage database and a long term storage database, as such databases are not kept synchronized as that term is defined by Bauer. Nor is there a motivation to provide a method of this type in which the short term storage database is used by an engine monitoring program for storage and analysis.

By contrast, Applicants' Claim 1 as herein amended recites, "... downloading data recorded in a flight data recorder to a program database retaining only recent data in a ground-based computer system having an engine monitoring program using said program

database for storage and analysis; ... extracting data from said program database ... [and] exporting said extracted data to said long term storage destination database ...". See the title of the Application, and the Application at page 1, lines 12-16; page 3, lines 16-18; page 3, line 25 to page 4, line 6 et seq., and page 8, line 29-30, for example. No such method is taught or suggested by Wright or Bauer or by a combination of their teachings. For these reasons, it is submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over Wright in view of Bauer.

Claim 2 depends directly from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claim 2 is considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claim 2 is likewise patentable over Wright in view of Bauer.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite features similar to those described above as being patentable over Wright in view of Bauer. For this reason, it is submitted that Claim 5 is likewise patentable over Wright in view of Bauer.

Claims 8-19 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 5. When the recitations of Claims 8-19 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 5, Applicants submit that Claims 8-19 are likewise patentable over Wright in view of Bauer.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-19 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Alan L. Cassel  
Registration No. 35,842  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070